

ונתן אלמא תלושין והא מחוברין נינהו –

‘And he shall give’; indicating detached, but they are connected

OVERVIEW

The פרה אדומה states,¹ regarding gathering the water to be mixed with the ashes, מים חיים אל כלי. ונתן עליו מים חיים אל כלי. We derive from the words מים חיים אל כלי that the vessel in which the מים חיים is stored must be immersed in the spring to gather the water (but we do not draw the water [with another vessel] and pour it into the כלי). This is the meaning of 'והא מחוברין נינהו', the waters (when they go into the vessel) are attached to the spring. The word 'ונתן' however indicates that the water is put (poured) into the כלי; indicating that they are detached from the מעין before they enter the כלי. There is a dispute between רש"י and תוספות as to how to explain this ‘contradiction’ and its resolution.

פירוש² דונתן משמע דחשיב להו תלושין -

The explanation of the contradiction is **that 'ונתן' indicates that the תורה considers these waters in the כלי to be תלושין** (detached from the spring) -

והיינו לענין קבלת טומאה³ אף על פי שהן מחוברין -

This means that they are considered תלושין in regards to receiving טומאה, these waters in the כלי will receive טומאה **even though they are attached** to the מעין and should be exempt from receiving טומאה. This is the ‘contradiction’.

תוספות continues to explain what רבא is teaching us by pointing out this contradiction:

והשתא מייתי ראיה דאין השקה⁴ להקדש מן התורה⁵ וכן בתרומה נמי עבוד רבנן מעלה -

So now רבא brings proof that (just like) **התורה** **there is no השקה** regarding **הקדש** to spare it from טומאה, **and so too by תרומה the רבנן made a higher standard that planting טמא** does not make it טהור.

¹ במדבר (חוקת) יט, יז.

² The term פירוש is (usually) used by תוספות to indicate that the explanation is not the way we may have thought. Here רש"י תוספות is negating.

³ A spring is not susceptible to receive טומאה. In fact it is מטהר that which is טמא (if it is immersed in it). The water in the כלי which is immersed in the spring ought not to be מקבל טומאה (see footnote # 4), and nevertheless the תורה writes ונתן to teach us that it is מקבל טומאה.

⁴ השקה (literally kissing) refers to two bodies of water that are touching (kissing) each other. In our case the water in the כלי is kissing the water of the מעין. Generally השקה provides that the two bodies are like one and so in our case just as the מעין is not מקבל טומאה the same should apply to the water in the כלי, nevertheless the תורה teaches that מקבל טומאה here and the מים שבכלי can be מקבל טומאה.

⁵ See ‘Thinking it over’ # 2.

פרש"י comments on תוספות

ופירוש הקונטרס⁶ דחוק:⁷

However, s' explanation is awkward.

SUMMARY

The water in the כלי even though it is מחוברין to the מעין (and should not be מקבל since there is השקה to the מעין), nevertheless are considered תלושין (since the תורה writes ונתן) and are טומאה מקבל.

THINKING IT OVER

1. According to תוספות does the כלי need to be immersed in the מעין (to fill it with water), or can the water be poured into the כלי (from the מעין)?⁸

2. תוספות writes that דאין השקה להקדש מן התורה⁹. Firstly the מי חטאת (פרה) are not הקדש, but חולין. Secondly the גמרא stated previously that רבנן מעלה רבא, and רבא responded תוספות (מעלה דרבנן), how can תוספות write that דאין השקה להקדש מן התורה!¹⁰

⁶ See ד"ה אלא and ד"ה שתהא פרש"י (on לה, א). The contradiction according to פרש"י is a factual one; either it is תלושין or מחוברין. We resolve this contradiction by saying that מה"ת it can be תלושין, however the חכמים made a מעלה that it should be מחוברין, and similarly by תרומה there is the מעלה that זריעה does not remove the תרומה.

⁷ The difficulties may include that the מעלה by the מים has nothing to do with טומאה (as the other מעלות discussed in the גמרא); additionally the expression ונא מחוברין נינהו is better understood according to תוספות than according to פרש"י.

⁸ See דבר שמואל.

⁹ See footnote # 5.

¹⁰ See דבר שמואל.